

Office of the Clerk of the Court
P.O. Box 30052
Lansing 48909

Supreme Court Administrative Office
P.O. Box 30048
Lansing, MI 48909
ATTN: Friend of Court

Elizabeth Kaye Cornell
4246 Martin
Warren MI 48092

June 20, 2003

REGARDING: ADM 2003-22-1

To Whom It May Concern:

I am strongly opposed to modifying the child support payments if the child is with the non-custodial parents for more than 53 days of the year. This will unjustly cause undue stress on custodial parents since non-custodial parents are not required by law to exercise their awarded visitation days. Therefore, a non-custodial parent may be awarded more than 53 days in a year, their child support payment would be decreased, though they may never choose to take advantage of a single day of visitation. Further more, just because a non-custodial parent may see their child more than 53 days in a year, that does not take any financial burden off of the custodial parent. It is still the custodial parent that must use the child support awarded to provide clothes, shoes, school supplies, and other essentials. Furthermore, when non-custodial parents pick up their children for visitation, usually the custodial parent must provide the non-custodial parent with appropriate clothing and essential items for the visit.

ADM 2003-22-3 <formula/2003-22-03.pdf> - Proposed Changes in Child Support Formula Manual

(Shared Economic - Retroactive Application Clarification)

ADM 2003-22-10 <formula/2003-22-10.pdf> - Proposed Changes in Child Support Formula Manual

(Shared Economic - Threshold and Cubing)

I am fully against the modification that would NOT require each parent to insure the child(ren). Child care is extremely expensive and can significantly impact a parents financial stability, and if insurance is offered to both parents through an employer BOTH parents should be responsible for taking advantage of the insurance to try and minimize any out of pocket expenses. No individual can predict the future, a major catastrophe could happen to the child, which would financially affect both the custodial and non-custodial parents. Neither parent should be expected to incur additional costs/charges because one parent independently chose not to elect coverage on that child.

ADM 2003-22-8 <formula/2003-22-08.pdf> - Proposed Changes in Child Support Formula Manual

(Responsibility to Insure Children)

I am in full support of allocating health care premiums based on each parents respective income and not deducting premiums from the income used to calculate child support and providing a "reasonable cost of health care coverage". I think this is beneficial to ensuring that the custodial parent is not penalized as a result of the cost of insuring the child. Child Support payments are to

provide the child clothes, and other personal necessities, that is an expense outside of the purpose of child support and should not be deducted from income before calculated for support.

ADM 2003-22-5 <formula/2003-22-05.pdf> - Proposed Changes in Child Support Formula Manual
(Allocation of Health Care Insurance Premiums)

ADM 2003-22-7 <formula/2003-22-07.pdf> - Proposed Changes in Child Support Formula Manual
(Reasonable Cost of Health Care Coverage)

I am in ~~full support of~~ including Medical support into child support and provided a clearer guideline to the procedures surrounding acquiring payment of medical expenses from the non-custodial parent.

ADM 2003-22-9 <formula/2003-22-09.pdf> - Proposed Changes in Child Support Formula Manual
(Medical Support Changes)

Sincerely,



Elizabeth Kaye Cornell
4246 Martin
Warren, MI 48092